

Remarks

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application, and the indication that claims 2-17 contain allowable subject matter. The Office Action, however, rejected claim 1. In this submission, claims 2 and 8-17 have been rewritten to be presented in independent form. Also, claims 18-24 have been added. After entry of the foregoing amendments, and consideration of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claim 1 was tentatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Surig et al. (U.S. 4,851,954). For at least the following reasons, Applicant disagrees, and requests reconsideration of this rejection. Among other features, claim 1 recites a circuit comprising a first, second and third voltage divider, each of which comprises resistors having temperature-dependent resistances, outputting a first, second and third voltage and a voltage comparator comparing the first voltage with the second voltage, and the first voltage with the third voltage and respectively outputting a first and second signal according to the comparison results.

Surig does not teach or suggest that each voltage divider comprises resistors having temperature-dependent resistances. As shown in Figs. 1-2 of Surig, the Office Action considered that resistors 10-11 correspond to the first voltage divider of the invention defined by claim 1; that resistors 66-6 correspond to the second voltage divider of the invention defined by claim 1; and that resistors 77-7 correspond to the third voltage divider of the invention defined by claim 1.

As recited in the specification of Surig, only resistors 6 and 7 are NTC resistors. (see col. 3 lines 42-43). Therefore, the teachings of Surig cannot be properly applied to the invention of claim 1, as alleged by the Office Action. For this reason alone, claim 1 defines over the cited reference.

Claims 2-17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, as recited in page 2 of the Office Action.

Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. Insofar as claims 3-7 depend from claim 2, claims 3-7 are allowable.

Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. Insofar as claims 18-19 depend from claim 8, claims 9-12 are allowable.

Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to depend from claim 18 and claims 11 and 12 have been amended to depend from claim 19, claims 9-12 are allowable.

Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. Insofar as claims 20-21 depend from claim 13, claims 20-21 are allowable.

Claims 14 and 15 have been amended to depend from claim 20 and claims 16 and 17 have been amended to depend from claim 21, claims 14-17 are allowable.

Claims 22-24 have been added. Supports can be found in Fig. 8 and therefore no new matter has been added. Since Surig fails in teaching or suggesting the limitation of claims 22-24, claims 22-24 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons as described above, claims 1, 2, 8, 13, and 22 are allowable over the cited reference. Insofar as claims 3-7 depend from claim 2, they are also allowable. Insofar as claims 9-12 and 18-19 depend from claim 8, they are also allowable. Insofar as claims 14-17 and 20-21 depend from claim 13, they are also allowable. Insofar as claims 23-24 depend from claim 22, they are also allowable.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response to Office Action, beyond that which is separately identified in an accompanying fee-transmittal sheet. If, however, any fee additional is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500